

NEW YORK HERALD

BROADWAY AND ANN STREET.
JAMES GORDON BENNETT,
PROPRIETOR.

VOLUME XXXVII.....No. 52

AMUSEMENTS THIS AFTERNOON AND EVENING.

BOOTH'S THEATRE, Twenty-third st., corner Sixth av.—
OLIVIA CARAR.

GRAND OPERA HOUSE, corner of Fifth av. and 32d st.—
GERMAN OPERA.—LAFRANCE.

WOOD'S THEATRE, Broadway, corner 33d st.—Performance
afternoon and evening.—DARLING.

WALLACK'S THEATRE, Broadway and 11th street.—
THE VETERAN.

NIRLO'S THEATRE, 5th Broadway, between Prince and
Houston sts.—JACK UDDER.

BOWERY THEATRE, Bowery—CHORUS THE LINE—
BUFFALO BILL.

ST. JAMES' THEATRE, Twenty-eighth street and Broad-
way.—MARRIAGE.

FIFTH AVENUE THEATRE, Twenty-fourth street.—
THE NEW DRAMA OF DITTO.

OLYMPIC THEATRE, Broadway—THE BALLET FA-
NTOISE OF HUMPHREY ARTHUR.

MRS. F. B. CONWAY'S BROOKLYN THEATRE.—
THE DUKE'S MOTO.

THEATRE COMIQUE, 514 Broadway.—THE VOYAGE-
URS, NEGRO ACTS, AC.—DEVORE. Matinee at 2 1/2.

UNION SQUARE THEATRE, Fourteenth st. and Broad-
way.—NEGRO ACTS.—BULLDOG, BALLET, AC. Matinee.

TONY PASTOR'S OPERA HOUSE, No. 201 Bowery.—
NEGRO ENTERTAINMENT, BURLINGHOPE.

RYAN'S NEW OPERA HOUSE, 23d st., between 6th
and 7th.—RYAN'S MINSTRELS.

THIRTY-FOURTH STREET THEATRE, near Third ave-
nue.—VARIETY ENTERTAINMENT, MAIDEN.

SAN FRANCISCO MINSTREL HALL, 385 Broadway.—
THE SAN FRANCISCO MINSTRELS.

PAVILION, No. 628 Broadway.—THE VIENNA LADY OR-
CHESTRA.

NEW YORK CIRCUS, Fourteenth street.—SOURCES IN
THE RING, ACROBATS, AC.—MATINEE AT 2 1/2.

NEW YORK MUSEUM OF ANATOMY, 515 Broadway.—
SCIENCE AND ART.

DR. KAHN'S ANATOMICAL MUSEUM, 745 Broadway.—
SCIENCE AND ART.

TRIPLE SHEET.

New York, Wednesday, February 21, 1872.

CONTENTS OF TO-DAY'S HERALD.

PAGE.
1.—Advertisements.
2.—Advertisements.
3.—Washington: The "Sorehead" Senators—"Cam-
paign" with the President; Schurz Delivers
a Stunning Broadside and several Agonistic
Salvos; He "Will Stand or Fall" by the Sore-
heads; Northern Unionists a Galling Fire on Carl;
Excitement in the Galleries; the Diplomatic
Appropriation Bill in the House; Russian,
Spanish and British Difficulties; Forney or
Crawley?—The "Sorehead" Senators.—
Hop of the Columbia Yacht Club—Sudden
Deaths in the Station House.

4.—The Herald on the Nile: From Cairo to the
First Cataract; Scenes, Incidents and Victi-
mities of the Nile Season; The Slave Trade on
the Nile; Joining the Good Samaritan Among
the Egyptians; Reception by the Lieu-
tenant Governor in the Temple of Fann; Two
Giraffes on "The Nile"; The Central Park
Art Matters: The Great Bolt: The Anti-Grant
Movement and its Endorsers; Talks with the
Liberal Leaders in the Republican Rank;
Political Movement and Views—Fatal Dummy
Casualty.

5.—The Reform Charter: Enthusiastic Mass Meet-
ing at the Cooper Institute in Favor of its
Passage; Proportional Representation De-
bated; Pierce Outlasted Upon the Office-
Holding Remnants of the Tammany Ring—
Amusements: The Boston Jubilee—Historical
Society—The Swindling Sirens: Lobby Doris
at the Temple; "The Way to the Center of the
Earth"—New York University Commencement
Exercises—Republican General Committee—
Affairs in Texas—West Virginia Constitutional
Convention—A "City Enterprise" Exploded—
A Horrible Tragedy—Smallpox in Baltimore—
The Chinese (Mass) Murder—A Remarkable
Scene in a Paterson Courthouse—Alleged Malprac-
tice.

6.—Editorials: Leading Article, "The Carnival of
the Demagogues—The Senatorial Cabal—The
Country Sacrificed to Party."—Amusement
Announcements.

7.—Editorials (Continued from Sixth Page):—The
Alabama Claims—Telegrams from England,
France, Germany, Spain, Austria, India and
Java—General Sherman's Tour—Italy and the
Holy See—Jocelyn's Expedition—The Grand
Duke Alexis—European and Havana Mar-
kets—Business Notices.

8.—Emigration Committee: Investigation by the
Legislative Committee: The Finger Marks of
Two and Norton—Quarantine Investigation: The
Committee on Emigration and Navigation—
Work: Testimony of Witnesses: The
Health Officer Acting According to Law—The
Judiciary Committee—City Affairs—Brooklyn
Receivers—Sixty Grand Jury—Proceedings
in the Courts—A Belligerent Female—Another
Cotton Brokerage Office on Fire—Two Men
Killed in a Quarry.

9.—Financial and Commercial Reports—Domestic
Markets—Another Juvenile Homicide—Pec-
uniating Peter—Death of a Reputed Thief—Mar-
riages and Deaths—Advertisements.

10.—The Presidential Campaign: The First Com-
plete Platform for the Coming Contest—Lec-
ture by Victoria Woodhull at the Academy of
Music—Proceedings of the New Jersey, Ne-
braska and Minnesota Legislatures—Grand
Opera House—"Yankee"—Shipping Intellig-
ence—Advertisements.

11.—Advertisements.
12.—Advertisements.

SPECIAL PAYMENTS ARE DEFERRED FOR AT

least two years, according to the opinion of
the New York Gold Exchange, which body
entered into a lease of their present quarters
for a further term of two years from the 1st
of May.

BAD NEWS FOR EASTER WEEK.—The report
of the complete destruction of the clove crop
in the island of Java, which is telegraphed to
the HERALD from Batavia. People must
remain hopeful notwithstanding.

MORE DISQUIET FOR JOHN BULL.—The men
employed in two of the largest breweries in
England have struck work. What! no more
beer! "all-and-all" cut off? Worse than the
Alabama claims. Misfortunes never come
singly.

THE HERALD ON THE NILE.—We print on
another page of this morning's issue a letter
from our correspondent in Egypt. In the
letter referred to the correspondent describes
his progress from Cairo to the First Cataract.
The description is interesting, full in detail,
and will repay attentive perusal.

THE CABINET CRISIS IN SPAIN.—Señor
Sagasta has been charged with the duty of
forming a new Spanish Cabinet. He is likely
to organize a coalition Ministry, made up of
his own immediate party adherents and some
few members of the unionist party. This plan
may work. Sagasta's platform of political
moderation is set forth in his own words to the
Cortes in the HERALD to-day.

DISTURBED CONDITION OF THE FRENCH
PROVINCES.—The news from the French
provinces continues to be of the most unsatisfactory
character. The revolutionary sentiment is
everywhere evident, especially in the South of
France, and the authorities find it becoming
more and more difficult to discharge their
duties. Some time since it was reported that
a large quantity of munitions of war was dis-
covered at Lyons. This report has been sub-
sequently confirmed. In the capital of the
Rhône the revolutionary committees are as
active as beavers and are making converts to
their doctrines. No matter where we look
throughout the French republic, we find mat-
ters are getting so complicated that a political
convulsion, more or less severe, cannot be
much longer delayed.

The Carnival of the Demagogues—The
Senatorial Cabal—The Country Sacrificed
to Party.

Another day was surrendered to the dema-
gogues yesterday. The Senate met, listened
to Mr. Schurz and Mr. Morton and adjourned.
As we learn from our despatches it was what
the reporters would call a gala day. All the
galleries were filled, and the lobbies swarmed
with dames and gentlemen who could not gain
admission to the Chamber. The gallant Senator
Fenton came to the rescue of the ladies, and
the odd spaces on the floor, the cloak rooms,
and the cosy corners around the Vice
President's chair were decorated with the
gay colors of the ladies of Wash-
ington. Instead of a grave and sober
Senate, drowsily listening to the still, sooth-
ing waters of an old-fashioned debate, it must
have reminded our exemplary Vice President
of the scenes at the Young Men's Christian
Associations and temperance gatherings which,
unmindful of his political duties in New
Hampshire and Connecticut, he now and then
honors with his exhortations.

The demagogues can always attract an
audience in Washington; therefore this sin-
gular gathering was only what the Senate wit-
nesses when there is to be a sharp debate.
Mr. Schurz is a master of speech. His style is
keen and logical, although there is a poverty in
his rhetoric and especially his coloring, which
is not unusual to a man who speaks a strange
tongue. The speech of the Senator was
marked with taste. There was a logical dis-
cipline in his phrases which satisfies the schol-
arly taste; but it was a dishonest speech. The
Senator occupied a false position in a twofold
sense. Claiming to be a republican, holding
an office by the suffrages of a republican State,
and owing to that party manifold and distin-
guished honors, far beyond that of any young
man in the party, he has announced that, in
the event of the nomination of General Grant
by the Republican Convention, he will not
support the nomination. Now, we care
nothing about the republican or any
other party, and we would support
General Grant should he prove to be
as worthy as we have ever found him, no
matter what party nominated him. But there
is a law of honor in politics as in everything
else, and by this law Mr. Schurz is open to
the suspicion of being a dishonored man. He
says to the republican party virtually, "I
remain with you to destroy you; I sit in your
councils that I may act efficiently with the
enemy; I make republican speeches as
democratic campaign documents, because in
that way they are more efficient. Were I to
go over to the democrats and wear their
uniform, I should become as help-
less as Dixon, or Connecticut, or
Doolittle, or Frank Blair, or poor old Andrew
Johnson, out in the political desolation of Ten-
nessee. I would be eclipsed, as they are
eclipsed, by Thurman and Casserly and Bay-
ard. Then, if I enlisted in that party, I could
not make terms with it." When the Hessians
and Swiss mercenaries took their money and
fell into line they were ordinary soldiers after
all. It is surprising to us that Mr. Schurz
should willingly occupy a position which no
honorable member of a party can hold. It is
still more surprising that the watery-minded
leaders of the administration party should for
a moment permit it.

This is a grave offence in a political view.
However, the conscience of politicians is an
easy and yielding influence, and the accepted
ethics of party organizations are not always
marked by an exalted sense of propriety. But
Mr. Schurz has committed a still graver of-
fence. He is a Senator of the United States,
and whatever honorable enthusiasm and affec-
tion he may entertain toward his Fatherland,
his oath of citizenship, as well as his oath of
office, compels him to make every feeling sub-
ordinate to his allegiance. There is nothing
which an independent sovereign State views
with more concern than illicit communication
between its citizens and subjects and any for-
eign Power. When Citizen Genet came to the
United States, as the Minister of the French
republic, and endeavored to array the public
sentiment of the country against Washington,
because of what the impatient Frenchman
regarded as Washington's lukewarmness
towards the new republic, he was promptly
suppressed, although the political effect of
that proceeding was as hazardous in its way
as General Grant's offence against the my-
sterious ogre called the German vote. The
country was enthusiastic in its friendship for
France, and popular sympathy was extrava-
gant in favor of the new republic; but
when the French Envoy attempted to invade
the dignity of the Executive office the repub-
lic was as one man against him. There is no
name more infamous in our politics than that
of Aaron Burr. His services in the Revolution,
his skill in politics, his extraordinary
genius and acquirements, his confessed superi-
ority as a statesman and a jurist, did not
save him from a fate so terrible that it
is mournful even in its just severity. Aaron
Burr was certainly the intellectual
peer of Mr. Schurz or even
Mr. Sumner, and at one time stood as high
in the esteem of the people. He criticised
General Washington, as these eminent Senators
have criticised Grant, as a dull, heavy,
mediocre soldier and the centre of a military
ring, as grasping as any ring that has sur-
rounded the present administration. He went
further in his opposition, for those were fight-
ing days, and accompanied the head of this
ring to Weehawken one morning and shot him
through the body. The unpardonable political
offence of Aaron Burr was that he
allowed himself to enter into illicit
relations with a foreign Power, to take
part in intrigues that menaced the national
dignity. Now, we shall not do these Senators
the courtesy of comparing them with Aaron
Burr, but his life furnishes an admonition
which they of all men should remember. If
this preamble and resolution and the consequ-
ent discussion mean anything, it is that
Senators of the United States have been hold-
ing illicit dealings with the representative of
a foreign Power to the injury of the United
States. Mr. Schurz confesses that in pre-
paring his case he took counsel of the
Marquis de Chambrun, an attaché of the
French Legation. Why did he seek this
counsel? It was to prove that our government
had violated its neutral obligations to Ger-
many, to embroil us in a diplomatic difficulty
with that Power, and to prejudice our
own case with the tribunal at Geneva, by

showing that we sinned as gravely against
Germany as England sinned against us in the
time of the rebellion.

We make these averments on the authority
of Mr. Schurz himself, as expressed in his
speech in the Senate yesterday. The offence
which he committed is not unknown to our
laws. In the Fifth Congress, during the
Presidency of Mr. Adams, the elder, a statute
was passed expressly forbidding any citizen to
hold correspondence with any foreign govern-
ment, or its agent, with an intent to influence
the measures of that government in relation to
disputes with the United States, or intended
to defeat the measures of the United States.
This is made a high misdemeanor, and the
penalty is set down as a fine not exceeding
five thousand dollars and imprisonment for a
term not less than six months or more than
three years. Now, we do not know whether
this statute has been violated by Mr. Sumner
or Mr. Schurz. That must be determined by
those skilled in law and the construction of
statutes. There is one member in Congress
now under conviction in Washington, and a
statute to be sentenced for the violation of a
statute no less binding than that of 1797. We
should be grieved to see Mr. Sumner or Mr.
Schurz in the dock with ex-Congressman
Stokes, of Tennessee, and we shall be glad
to hear that the point made by Mr. Conkling,
that they may have subjected themselves to
this punishment, is unfounded; but the fact
that the suspicion of its violation has been
aroused, and justly aroused, shows to what
desperate straits impatient and angry dema-
gogues may be driven, when they allow for
one moment their political necessities to inter-
fere with their duties of allegiance.

It is plain to the minds of all men that this
latest intrigue against General Grant is a most
unworthy proceeding. Is there no real ground
of opposition to the President that Senators
must dishonor themselves as members of a
party or run the risk of indictment for violat-
ing the law? Have we lost all sense of that
delicate and chivalrous loyalty to the republic
and its chief which would lead us, no matter
how frail and weak the administration had
been, to imitate the patriarchal example, and
walk backward with averted gaze to hide
the shame? Can we have no politics untainted
with calumny and detraction and disloyalty?
It would seem from the debate of yesterday
that all sense of this had departed from the
Senate. We see little difference between this
Senate of demagogues and partisans who now
hold carnival in Washington and the Senate of
Rome in the latter days of the empire, and
the Senate of France which tamely registered
the decrees of Bonaparte. Beautiful is inde-
pendence of thought, and all honor to the many
Senators who calmly tread the path of duty,
whatever winds of detraction sweep over it.
But it is not independence to make a cowardly
war upon the President, as the head of a
military ring, because he gave offence to a
sensitive scholar from Massachusetts, and an
irritable and exacting young refugee from
Missouri. Nor is there any path of duty
which leads into the closets of foreign legations,
to find the inspiration of a conspiracy
against the peace and dignity and honorable
name of the republic.

The Seventy's Charter Experiment—The
Committee at Cooper Institute.

There was a good attendance of the Com-
mittee of Seventy and their friends at the
Cooper Institute last night, to hear what the
advocates of the experimental charter had to
say in its favor. Several speeches were made,
in many of which the orators fought over
again the battle decided in the last
election, and said little or nothing about
the charter that is to give us as
many votes as a cat is reputed to have lives,
and to supply us with a city government in
which every political organization, clique and
faction is to have a representation. Messrs.
Solomons and Sterns, the champions of the
theory of cumulative voting and minority rep-
resentation, were, of course, eloquent in its
favor; but as a general thing the speakers
fought shy of the question. No one explained
how the little difficulty of the constitutional
objection was to be disposed of or attempted to
prove the advantages of having mixed com-
missions at the heads of all the city depart-
ments, some elected by one power and some
by another, with no direct responsibility any-
where and no direct authority vested in Leg-
islature or Executive. There was no argument
to prove, for instance, how greatly the
despatch of business would be facilitated in
the Department of Finance by associat-
ing four Commissioners or sub-Commissioners
with the acting Comptroller in the
management of our financial affairs. Yet a
few words from Comptroller Green, who has
so ably extricated the city from a terrible
financial muddle, would have been both inter-
esting and instructive on this point. Singu-
larly enough, it did not occur to any orator to
cite the well-known honesty and efficiency of
our old, politically-balanced Board of Super-
visors, or the incorruptible and honorable
character of the bygone metro-
politan and Tammany mixed com-
missions, in which democrats and republicans
have been sandwiched together as precedents
to prove how admirably the proposed munic-
ipal hodge-podge of cumulative voting and
minority representation may be expected to
work. We were told how grand and glorious
a thing it would be for every sore-headed poli-
tician and dissatisfied conventionist to possess
the power of turning his bolting proclivities
to practical advantage through the
means of the legalized repeating con-
templated in the experimental charter; but
all were not informed how the citizens
were to be protected against dickerings, bar-
gains and conspiracies after these conflicting
elements shall have been drawn together in a
happy family of minority representation over
every department in the city government as
well as in the Board of Aldermen.

The meeting last night, so far as the public
sentiment of the city is claimed to have been
made manifest at it, was a mere sham. The
State Legislature would fall into error should
it regard it as any indication of the desire
of the citizens of New York to be sub-
jected to the singular experiment proposed in
the Stern and Salomon charter. What our
people really demand and really need is a
strong, centralized, responsible and simple
government, and the sooner the Legislature
gives us one, protected by a sound and efficient
election law, the better. The population and

the interests of New York are too large to be
made the subject of an experiment of doubtful
constitutional and questionable wisdom at
best. We have had enough of irresponsible
government, of mixed and muddled machinery,
of anarchy, confusion and corrupt trad-
ing and bargaining; and these are the
only certain results that can be foreseen
from the adoption of the charter proposed by
the theorists of the Cooper Institute Com-
mittee. Let us now have a practical law to live
under, even if the various parties, cliques
and factions that assume the character of
political organizations should be doomed to
remain unrepresented in the city government.

The Alabama Question—Our Real Case
with England—Have We Committed Any
Fault?

The discussions in England on the Alabama
case and the tone of the English press demon-
strate a proposition that has all along been
advanced by the HERALD. The anxiety of
Mr. Gladstone to explain his speech at the
opening of the session, and to make himself
right with his party without invoking the
maledictions of the *Times* and the destruction
of his government, shows that the whole
clamor against America, so far as the Mili-
tary is concerned, is simply an effort to
retain power. To make this exhibit clear it
was necessary to allege some violations of
the treaty, or some subterfuge or trick on the
part of the United States. In fact, the only
basis of the English discussions has been that
our Commissioners in some way entrapped
the English Commissioners to sign a treaty
which they did not understand or which had
a meaning foreign to the letter and spirit of
the treaty and its conception by the Gladstone
Ministry.

Now, let us look at this phase of the dis-
cussion for a moment. If it be true that we
took an advantage of the English Ministers;
that we signed a treaty which had one mean-
ing on its face and another under the surface;
that we made a case and sent it to Geneva
which advanced pretensions not warranted by
the treaty nor by any of the discussions in the
session of the Joint High Commission, then
we have behaved dishonorably to England,
and must either withdraw our case or
make due explanations. We cannot afford
to hold this position. Whatever
we may think of the conduct of the English
during our war; however we may resent the
equipment of rebel cruisers in the Mersey to
destroy our commerce, we have no right in a
solemn treaty stipulation to go beyond the
express understanding of the high contracting
Powers. The whole value of our case, as we
have regarded it, is that the record will show
that in no respect have we taken an advantage
of England. We go to Geneva with clean
hands. We shall say nothing to the members
of that august tribunal that was not said at the
treaty conferences to Lord de Grey and his
associates by Secretary Fish. The whole mat-
ter of consequential damages is not a new
thing, but merely a legal expression of an old
story. So far from abandoning our claims for
reimbursement for the unavoidable losses
caused by the Alabama and the other cruisers,
we presented them in the deliberations pre-
ceding the signature of the treaty. They
were contemplated in the protocols, and not
to have advanced them would have been un-
worthy and improper.

As we have said, our treaty has this value
or it is valueless. The whole argument of the
English press is that it is void, because of the
absence of these claims for consequential
damages. Now, these conditions were ex-
pressly understood by the English govern-
ment. Every point presented and elaborated
by the precise and careful author of our case
had been considered in the discussions at
Washington. The American Commissioners
expressly informed the English Com-
missioners that there could be no
fair adjudication of the matter in issue
that did not contemplate the sacrifices of our
commerce. The expenses we incurred to
catch the English cruisers and the prolonga-
tion of the war; whether these claims were
valid or not; whether or not the English could
show that in some way the inefficiency of
Secretary Welles and the apathy of our naval
authorities in pursuit condoned the offence,
and so relieved England from all responsi-
bility; whether or not there were principles
of international law which made it
improper for the tribunal to award
constructive or consequential damages;
whether, in brief, we would get
one million, or one hundred millions, or
nothing, were questions which would have to
be decided by the Court at Geneva. By that
decision we should be bound. But we should
certainly go into Court advancing certain
claims. We should make our case in our own
way. We plainly informed the members of
the English Commission what the manner of
that case would be.

So we, therefore, dispel the illusion which
seems to rest upon the mind of the English
press and people. The whole discussion, so
far as England is concerned, has sprung from
the belief that in some way we deceived the
English Commissioners. Now the facts are
that the reverse is the truth. This will be
further seen in our despatches from London.
When Mr. Disraeli asked Mr. Gladstone
whether the American case had been presented
to the English Cabinet early in February, as
he had supposed, or early in December, as he
had been more recently informed; whether, as
he meant to infer, the case was a surprise to
the Cabinet, as an old, carefully considered
story, Mr. Gladstone declined to reply. What
Mr. Gladstone should have said, had the in-
terests of the government permitted, was that
whether or not the exact case of the Ameri-
can government came to him in December or
February was immaterial; that the points of
that case were known to him before the treaty
was signed; for we are certainly bound to
infer that if Mr. Fish, in presenting the Ameri-
can view of the Alabama question to the
Commission, referred to the consequential
damages as a necessary consideration, the
circumstance was reported to London. The
English diplomats were men of too much
ability and experience to admit of these
claims, or to permit them to go into the
treaty even by inference, without taking
the orders of the government. This is too
plain a proposition to be denied. Know-
ing, therefore, that Mr. Fish advanced these
consequential damages before submitting
the protocols, knowing that they were

duly considered by Lord de Grey and his col-
leagues; knowing that they were submitted to
the English Cabinet; knowing that the Com-
missioners had the orders of the Cabinet not
to protest against Mr. Fish's presentation,
the conclusion is unerring that this whole
case was well known to the English govern-
ment, that it was accepted as the proper plea
to be made at Geneva, and that it would be
met in the proper way with all the skill and
genius of the British Council.

With this revelation of the truth of this un-
fortunate complication which comes to us from
Washington and is confirmed from London,
where does America stand? Simply where
she has stood from the beginning. She has
surprised nobody, taken no undue advantage
of her antagonist, advanced no claim that was
not perfectly understood in the Washington
discussions. The question then arises, Shall
we amend our claim, or withdraw a case
which is not a surprise to England, but
made perfectly plain to her months
ago, merely because Mr. Disraeli is an-
xious to overthrow Mr. Gladstone and
the newspapers have had another visitation of
the anti-American pains? This is really the
whole situation. All of this surprise and
anger and excitement, these open-eyed and
wondering protests of Mr. Hughes, the unfor-
tunate after-dinner rhetoric of Mr. Gladstone,
which the cable now informs us he regrets and
disavows, simply came from the ignorance of
the English people as to the real merits of the
question and the failure of the government to
instruct them. But are we to blame for
that? Mr. Gladstone has our sympathies.
We would do no harm to his Ministry, but we
had no concern with his quarrels with the
tories. We cannot go to the world and admit
that we were deluding England in the pre-
sentation of our treaty, because such an
admission would confuse Mr. Disraeli and
save Mr. Gladstone. We cannot do this for
one paramount reason—that it would be the
avowal of what we knew to be false and of
what England knows to be false.

From day to day our case becomes clearer.
The position assumed by General Grant and
the accomplished and wary Secretary of State
grows stronger every day. We have acted in
this whole matter with frankness and courtesy.
We have declared our willingness to
go into Court and come out without a
dollar, if so decided. It may be, as
Sir Charles Dilke says, that the English have
made this blunder because they had no true
conception of America or her institutions. We
quite agree with Sir Charles Dilke. We have
expressed the same view from the beginning
of the discussion. The moral of it all is that
America is enough of a country for English
statesmen to learn something about its laws
and customs, and especially its value of treaty
obligations.

The Erie Railroad Bills—An Opportunity
for the People.

There are at present two prominent bills
before the State Legislature designed to
secure to the stockholders of the Erie
Railroad protection for their property and
a restoration of their legal rights;
the one, Senator O'Brien's bill, to re-
peal the Classification act, and to provide for
a fair election of directors in July next;
the other, the Assembly bill, pressed by Attorney
General Barlow, conferring upon that officer
extraordinary powers over corporations for the
purpose of enabling him to institute summary
proceedings against the present directors of
Erie and to obtain possession of their books.
These two measures do not necessarily conflict;
nevertheless it would be well to withdraw the
Assembly bill, which is open to serious objec-
tions, and to leave Senator O'Brien's repeal
bill, which is a simple measure of justice,
alone before the Legislature. Special legisla-
tion is at all times objectionable, and of
late years it has been too much the practice
of our legislators to crowd the statute book
with laws designed to meet special emer-
gencies or to accomplish special ob-
jects. In the eagerness to effect a
particular purpose no thought is given to
the mischief that may be done in other
directions. The present Attorney General
may be honestly anxious to reach the Erie
Ring for the public good; but to accomplish
that end he would place in the hands of
Attorney Generals of the State who may
come after him extraordinary powers never
before contemplated under our political sys-
tem, and liable to be dangerously abused by
less scrupulous men. The repeal of the
Classification act, and the assurance to the
bona fide stockholders of the Erie Railroad
corporation of a fair election of directors at
an early day, would render the legislation
contemplated by the Assembly bill unneces-
sary. The protection of the stockholders' in-
terests would be secured without a resort
to extreme legal proceedings. The Erie
Ring directors ask nothing better than an
opportunity to avert a direct vote by the
Legislature on the simple question of the re-
peal of the Classification act. The reform
majority can justify opposition to such a bill
as that now before the Assembly committee on
a dozen plausible pleas; but to vote against
the direct proposition to end the term of office
of the present corrupt combination and to re-
store to the stockholders of the Erie Railroad
the right to say who shall hold and
manage their property, is to insure a reputa-
tion as unenviable as that which attaches to
the debauched legislators of 1869. Not a
single reform member can hope to justify a
vote against Senator O'Brien's bill. To sup-
port the repeal of the Classification act and a
fair election of directors is not even to oppose
Gold, Lane and their associates, unless it be
conceded that they are playing the part of
frebooters and holding on illegally to prop-
erty that does not belong to them. If they
enjoy the confidence of the stockholders they
will be re-elected; if they do not they have
no right to the positions they now fill. To
vote against Senator O'Brien's bill is to vote
to confirm lawlessness and fraud, and no one
will believe that a representative elected un-
der the banner of reform would so grossly
betray the cause he professes to uphold with-
out having been well paid for his treason.

One-half the session is now over, and up to
the present time, although the repeal bill was
introduced by Senator O'Brien on the first day
of the organization of the Senate, a vote has
been avoided. The constituents of the Sen-
ators who are hanging back from the work
they were elected to perform should insist

upon immediate action on the bill as soon as
the Legislature reassembles. Before election
the republican party pledged themselves to
overthrow the twin monsters of corruption,
the Tammany and Erie rings. If they are
false to this pledge the people who gave them
their present overwhelming power in the
State will hold them to a strict
accountability. Already it is too well
known that the infamous laws by means of
which both Tammany and Erie conspirators
have been enabled to consummate their
schemes of plunder, have been the work of
debauched republican Legislatures. The re-
publicans now have over a three-fourths
majority in both Senate and Assembly, and
they cannot either avoid responsibility or
divide it with any other party, for all the
legislation of the present session. Let them
now sell their votes once more to the Erie
Ring and the Erie lobby, and the people will
treat them next fall as they treated the Tam-
many leaders last November.

Progress of the Mexican Revolutionists—Con-
tinuance of Mexican Chaos—How Long?

From our special correspondents in the
Northern frontier States of Mexico we have
information of the progress of the revolution-
ists in that distracted country which warrants
the opinion that before the lapse of many
weeks President Juarez, driven from the
"halls of the Montezumas," will be on the trail
of his illustrious predecessor, General Don
Antonio Lopez de Santa Anna, "*benemerito de la patria*," heading for the island of St.
Thomas. How is he to resist the onrushing
of revolutionary forces closing around him?
General Trevino, then commander in Northern
Mexico, telegraphs to General Quiroga, near
the Rio Grande, that he is moving on San
Luis Potosi with twelve thousand men, and
would take the city immediately, whence,
with his military supplies and reinforcements
gained from this important victory, he would
push right on to the city of Mexico. Mean-
time reinforcements and some heavy artillery
are coming down to Quiroga from Monterey to
assist him in his attack on Matamoros, which
is held only by a small force of the adherents
of Juarez.

With the capture of Matamoros all the
northeastern section of Mexico, from San
Luis Potosi to the Rio Grande, will be in
possession of the revolutionists. At the same
time in the Northwest, in the State of Sinaloa,
which is on the Gulf of California, the revolu-
tionary General Marquez has defeated the
government forces under Pesquera, capturing
their artillery, arms and ammunition. All
these reverses to Juarez, following that at
Zacatecas, turn over more than half of the
territory of the republic (such as it is) into
the hands of the revolutionists. And yet
again, nearer to the national capital, Porfirio
Diaz is gathering strength; a rebel force of
two thousand men is in the field in Jalisco,
and General Magana has pronounced against
Juarez in Colima. So we conclude that be-
fore the expiration of many weeks Juarez
will be driven out of the Mexican government,
and that some revolutionary leader, most
likely Diaz, will take his place.

And then? Why, then we shall have a
Cabinet, a new distribution of the spoils, elec-
tions for a new President, say Diaz, and a
new Congress; then a meeting of the new
Congress, then a new tax levy and then
another revolution; and all this before the
present one is relieved of its fighting factions.
And so among these fighting factions they
keep it up all the time. One revolution runs
into another in the capital, while in the dis-
tant States the fighting factions are still
engaged in hunting and driving each other
from the field. Of course, in the midst of
this continual ferment, there is no security to
the citizen or the stranger in life or property.
Highwaymen flourish, and flourish most on
the most profitable lines of travel; industry
is prostrated, trade is suspended and all the
vast and varied resources of one of the very
richest countries in the world lie dormant or
are wasted from these incessant civil broils
and wars. As Milton says of the wars of the
Saxon Heptarchy, that they were as senseless
as the squabbles of so many kites and crows
in the air, we may as truly say of these Mexi-
can revolutions. They settle nothing and they
signify nothing but fighting. To be sure, the
battles between these hostile Mexican fac-
tions are not very bloody. They are, in
fact, comparatively and ridiculously harmless
to the combatants; but they keep the whole
country in pretty much the savage condition
of Paris under the reign of the Commune.

And still the question recurs, how can
these evils of our sister republic (such as it is)
be remedied? And still the answer is at hand,
only by the decisive measures on the part of
the United States of armed intervention and
annexation. On the plea of law, order and
the general interests of humanity and civiliza-
tion, Napoleon established his imperial pro-
tectorate over Mexico; on the plea of the
Monroe doctrine we convinced him that he
was "in the wrong shop," and he left it. In
the interests of the civilized world, therefore,
the responsibility for law and order in Mexico
falls upon us. Half a century of revolutions
has proved that the Mexicans cannot govern
th